

INVARIANT FORMS AND AUTOMORPHISMS OF A CLASS OF MULTISYMPLECTIC MANIFOLDS

A. IBORT*

*Departamento de Matemáticas
Universidad Carlos III de Madrid
Avda. Universidad 30,
E-28911 Leganés, Madrid, SPAIN*

A. ECHEVERRÍA-ENRÍQUEZ, M. C. MUÑOZ-LECANDA[†], N. ROMÁN-ROY[‡]

*Departamento de Matemática Aplicada y Telemática
Campus Norte U.P.C., Módulo C-3
C/ Jordi Girona 1
E-08034 Barcelona, SPAIN*

Abstract

It is shown that the geometry of a class of multisymplectic manifolds, that is, smooth manifolds equipped with a closed nondegenerate form of degree greater than 1, is characterized by their automorphisms. Such a class is distinguished by a *local homogeneity* property. Thus, *locally homogeneous multisymplectic manifolds* extend the family of classical geometries possessing a similar property: symplectic, volume and contact. The proof of the first result relies on the characterization of invariant differential forms with respect to the graded Lie algebra of infinitesimal automorphisms and on the study of the local properties of Hamiltonian vector fields on multisymplectic manifolds. In particular it is proved that the group of multisymplectic diffeomorphisms acts transitively on the manifold. It is also shown that the graded Lie algebra of infinitesimal automorphisms of a locally homogeneous multisymplectic manifold characterizes their multisymplectic diffeomorphisms.

Key words: *Multisymplectic manifolds, multisymplectic diffeomorphisms, invariant forms, Hamiltonian (multi-) vector fields, graded Lie algebras.*

AMS s. c. (2000): 53C15, 53D35, 57R50, 57S25, 58A10.

*e-mail: ALBERTOI@MATH.UC3M.ES

†e-mail: MATMCML@MAT.UPC.ES

‡e-mail: MATNRR@MAT.UPC.ES

1 Introduction and statement of the main results

It is well-known that some classical geometrical structures are determined by their automorphism groups, for instance it was shown by Banyaga [3], [4], [5] that the geometric structures defined by a volume or a symplectic form on a differentiable manifold are determined by their automorphism groups, the groups of volume preserving and symplectic diffeomorphisms respectively, i.e., if (M_i, α_i) , $i = 1, 2$ are two paracompact connected smooth manifolds equipped with volume or symplectic forms α_i and $G(M_i, \alpha_i)$ denotes the group of volume preserving or symplectic diffeomorphisms, then if $\Phi: G(M_1, \alpha_1) \rightarrow G(M_2, \alpha_2)$ is a group isomorphism, there exists (modulo an additional condition in the symplectic case) a unique C^∞ -diffeomorphism $\varphi: M_1 \rightarrow M_2$ such that $\Phi(f) = \varphi \circ f \circ \varphi^{-1}$, for all $f \in G(M_1, \alpha_1)$ and $\varphi^* \alpha_2 = c \alpha_1$, with c a constant. In other words, group isomorphisms of automorphism groups of classical structures (symplectic, volume) are inner, in the sense that they correspond to conjugation by (conformal) diffeomorphisms.

An immediate consequence of the previous theorem is that if (M, α) is a manifold with a classical structure (volume or symplectic) and the differential form β is an invariant for the group $G(M, \alpha)$, then necessarily β has to be a constant multiple of exterior powers of α . In other words, the only differential invariants of the groups of classical diffeomorphism are multiples of exterior powers of the defining geometrical structure. The infinitesimal counterpart of this result was already known in the realm of Classical Mechanics. In 1947 Lee Hwa Chung stated a theorem concerning the uniqueness of invariant integral forms (the Poincaré-Cartan integral invariants) under canonical transformations [21]. His aim was to use that result in order to characterize canonical transformations in the Hamiltonian formalism of Mechanics; that is, canonical transformations are characterized as those transformations mapping every Hamiltonian system into another Hamiltonian one with respect to the same symplectic structure. Afterwards, this result was discussed geometrically [24] and generalized to presymplectic Hamiltonian systems [17, 12]. The main result there was that in a given a symplectic (resp. presymplectic) manifold, the only differential forms invariant with respect to all Hamiltonian vector fields are multiples of (exterior powers of) the symplectic (resp. presymplectic) form. Since symplectic and presymplectic manifolds represent the phase space of regular and singular Hamiltonian systems respectively, this result allows to identify canonical transformations in the Hamiltonian formalism of Mechanics with the symplectomorphisms and presymplectomorphisms group, on each case.

Returning to the general problem of the relation between geometric structures and their group of automorphisms, it is an open question to determine which geometrical structures are characterized by them. Apart from symplectic and volume, contact structures also fall into this class [6]. Recent work of Grabowski shows that similar statements hold for Jacobi and Poisson manifolds [19, 1]. Our main result shows that a class of multisymplectic manifolds are determined by their automorphisms (finite and infinitesimal). Multisymplectic manifolds are one of the natural generalizations of symplectic manifolds. A multisymplectic manifold of degree k is a smooth manifold M equipped with a closed nondegenerate form Ω of degree $k \geq 2$ (see [9, 10] for more details on multisymplectic manifolds). In particular multisymplectic manifolds include symplectic and volume manifolds. A diffeomorphism φ between two multisymplectic manifolds (M_i, Ω_i) , $i = 1, 2$, will be called a multisymplectic diffeomorphism if $\varphi^* \Omega_2 = \Omega_1$. The group of multisymplectic diffeomorphisms of a multisymplectic manifold (M, Ω) will be denoted by $G(M, \Omega)$. Multisymplectic structures represent distinguished co-

homology classes of the manifold M but their origin as a geometrical tool can be traced back to the foundations of the calculus of variations. It is well known that the suitable geometric framework to describe (first order) field theories are certain multisymplectic manifolds (see, for instance [11, 15, 16, 18, 20, 23, 25, 30, 31] and references quoted therein). The automorphism groups of multisymplectic manifolds play a relevant role in the description of the corresponding system and it is a relevant problem to characterize them in similar terms as in symplectic geometry.

A crucial property for multisymplectic structures is their local homogeneity properties (see Section 4). Then, working with multisymplectic manifolds verifying this property, our main results are:

Theorem 1 *Let (M_i, Ω_i) , $i = 1, 2$, be two locally homogeneous multisymplectic manifolds and $G(M_i, \Omega_i)$ will denote their corresponding groups of automorphisms. Let $\Phi: G(M_1, \Omega_1) \rightarrow G(M_2, \Omega_2)$ be a group isomorphism which is also a homeomorphism when $G(M_i, \Omega_i)$ are endowed with the point-open topology. Then, there exists a C^∞ diffeomorphism $\varphi: M_1 \rightarrow M_2$, such that $\Phi(f) = \varphi \circ f \circ \varphi^{-1}$ for all $f \in G(M_1, \Omega_1)$ and the tangent map φ_* maps locally Hamiltonian vector fields of (M_1, Ω_1) into locally Hamiltonian vector fields of (M_2, Ω_2) . In addition, if we assume that φ_* maps all infinitesimal automorphisms of (M_1, Ω_1) into infinitesimal automorphisms of (M_2, Ω_2) then there is a constant c such that $\varphi^* \Omega_2 = c \Omega_1$.*

This result generalizes the main theorems in [3] (Thms. 1 and 2) which are in turn generalizations of a theorem by Takens [32]. The proof presented here, contrary to the proof in [3], will not rely on the generalization by Omori [28] of Pursell-Shanks theorem [29] which do not apply to this situation because of the lack of local normal forms for multisymplectic structures. However we will use the following partial generalization of Lee Hwa Chung theorem.

Theorem 2 *Let (M, Ω) be a locally homogeneous multisymplectic manifold of degree k , then the only differential forms of degree k invariant under the graded Lie algebra of infinitesimal automorphisms of Ω are real multiples of Ω .*

Local properties of multisymplectic diffeomorphisms of locally homogeneous multisymplectic manifolds will play a crucial role along the discussion. They steam from a localization property for Hamiltonian vector fields that will be discussed in Lemma 2. These local properties are used to prove another result interesting on its own: the group of multisymplectic diffeomorphisms acts transitively on the underlying manifold. The transitivity of the group of multisymplectic diffeomorphisms relies on the fact that Hamiltonian vector fields span the tangent bundle of the manifold as shown in Lemma 3.

The paper is organized as follows: in Section 2 we establish some basic definitions and results, mainly related with the geometry of multisymplectic manifolds. Section 3 is devoted to the definition and basic properties of the graded Lie algebra of the infinitesimal automorphisms of multisymplectic manifolds. In Section 4 the definition and some characteristics of locally homogeneous multisymplectic manifolds is stated, in particular the localization lemma for multisymplectic diffeomorphisms, and the strong local transitivity of the group of multisymplectic diffeomorphisms is proved for locally homogeneous multisymplectic manifolds. In

Section 5 we will prove the main results on the structure of differential invariants of locally homogeneous multisymplectic manifolds. Finally, in Section 6, these results are used to characterize the multisymplectic transformations and the proof of the main theorem is completed in Section 7.

All manifolds are real, paracompact, connected and C^∞ . All maps are C^∞ . Sum over crossed repeated indices is understood.

2 Notation and basic definitions

Let M be a n -dimensional differentiable manifold. Sections of $\Lambda^m(TM)$ are called *m-multivector fields* in M , and we will denote by $\mathfrak{X}^m(M)$ the set of m -multivector fields in M . Let $\Omega \in \Omega^k(M)$ be a differentiable k -form in M ($k \leq n$). For every $x \in M$, the form Ω_x establish a correspondence $\hat{\Omega}_m(x)$ between the set of m -multivectors $\Lambda^m(T_x M)$ and the $(k-m)$ -forms $\Lambda^{k-m}(T_x^* M)$ as

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \hat{\Omega}_m(x) & : & \Lambda^m(T_x M) \longrightarrow \Lambda^{k-m}(T_x^* M) \\ & & v \longmapsto i(v)\Omega_x \end{array}.$$

If v is homogeneous, $v = v_1 \wedge \dots \wedge v_m$, then $i(v)\Omega_x = i(v_1 \wedge \dots \wedge v_m)\Omega_x = i(v_1) \dots i(v_m)\Omega_x$. Thus, an m -multivector $X \in \mathfrak{X}^m(M)$ defines a contraction $i(X)$ of degree m of the algebra of differential forms in M .

The k -form Ω is said to be *m-nondegenerate* (for $1 \leq m \leq k-1$) iff, for every $x \in M$ the subspace $\ker \hat{\Omega}_m(x)$ has minimal dimension. Such subspace will be usually denoted by $\ker^m \Omega_x$. If Ω is m -nondegenerate and $\binom{n}{m} \leq \binom{n}{k-m}$, then $\dim(\ker^m \Omega_x) = 0$, but if $\binom{n}{m} > \binom{n}{k-m}$, then $\dim(\ker^m \Omega_x) = \binom{n}{m} - \binom{n}{k-m}$. The form Ω will be said to be *strongly nondegenerate* iff it is m -nondegenerate for every $m = 1, \dots, k-1$. Thus, the m -nondegeneracy of Ω implies that the map $\hat{\Omega}_m: \Lambda^m(TM) \rightarrow \Lambda^{k-m}(T^*M)$ is a bundle monomorphism in the first situation or a bundle epimorphism in the second case. The image of the bundle TM by $\hat{\Omega}_m$ will be denoted by E_m . Often, if there is no risk of confusion, we will omit the subindex m and we will denote $\hat{\Omega}_m$ simply by $\hat{\Omega}$.

If $X \in \mathfrak{X}^m(M)$, the graded bracket

$$[d, i(X)] = di(X) - (-1)^m i(X)d$$

where d denotes as usual the exterior differential on M , defines a new derivative of degree $m-1$, denoted by $L(X)$. If $X \in \mathfrak{X}^i(M)$, and $Y \in \mathfrak{X}^j(M)$ the graded commutator of $L(X)$ and $L(Y)$ is another operation of degree $i+j-2$ of the same type, i.e., there will exists a $(i+j-1)$ -multivector denoted by $[X, Y]$ such that,

$$[L(X), L(Y)] = L([X, Y]).$$

The bilinear assignement $X, Y \mapsto [X, Y]$ is called the Schouten-Nijenhuis bracket of X, Y .

Let X, Y and Z homogeneous multivectors of degrees i, j, k respectively, then the Schouten-Nijenhuis bracket verifies the following properties:

1. $[X, Y] = -(-1)^{(i+1)(j+1)}[Y, X]$.
2. $[X, Y \wedge Z] = [X, Y] \wedge Z + (-1)^{(i+1)(j+1)}Y \wedge [X, Z]$.
3. $(-1)^{(i+1)(k+1)}[X, [Y, Z]] + (-1)^{(j+1)(i+1)}[Y, [Z, X]] + (-1)^{(k+1)(j+1)}[Z, [X, Y]] = 0$.

The exterior algebra of multivectors has the structure of an odd Poisson algebra, sometimes also called a Schouten algebra. This allows us to define an structure of an odd Poisson graded manifold on M whose sheaf of superfunctions is given by the sheaf of multivector fields and the odd Poisson bracket is the Schouten bracket.

Definition 1 *Let M be a n -dimensional differentiable manifold and $\Omega \in \Omega^k(M)$. The couple (M, Ω) is said to be a multisymplectic manifold if Ω is closed and 1-nondegenerate. The degree k of the form Ω will be called the degree of the multisymplectic manifold.*

Thus, multisymplectic manifolds of degree $k = 2$ are the usual symplectic manifolds, and manifolds with a distinguished volume form are multisymplectic manifolds of degree its dimension. Other examples of multisymplectic manifolds are provided by compact semisimple Lie groups equipped with the canonical cohomology 3-class, symplectic 6-dimensional Calabi-Yau manifolds with the canonical 3-class, etc. Notice that there are no multisymplectic manifolds of degrees 1 or $n - 1$ because $\ker \Omega$ is nonvanishing in both cases.

Apart from the already cited, another very important class of multisymplectic manifolds are the *multicotangent bundles*: let Q be a manifold, and $\pi: \Lambda^k(T^*Q) \rightarrow Q$ the bundle of k -forms in Q . Then, $\Lambda^k(T^*Q)$ is endowed with a canonical k -form $\Theta \in \Omega^k(\Lambda^k(T^*Q))$ defined as follows: if $\alpha \in \Lambda^k(T^*Q)$, and $U_1, \dots, U_k \in T_\alpha(\Lambda^k(T^*Q))$, then

$$\Theta_\alpha(U_1, \dots, U_k) := i(\pi_* U_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \pi_* U_k) \alpha$$

If $(x^i, p_{i_1, \dots, i_k})$ is a system of natural coordinates in $W \subset \Lambda^k(T^*Q)$, then

$$\Theta|_W = p_{i_1, \dots, i_k} dx^{i_1} \wedge \dots \wedge dx^{i_k}$$

Therefore, $\Omega := -d\Theta \in \Omega^{k+1}(\Lambda^k(T^*Q))$ is a 1-nondegenerate form. Such a structure is often called a *multicotangent bundle*.

Multisymplectic structures of degree ≥ 3 are abundant. In fact, as it is shown in [26], if M is a smooth manifold of dimension ≥ 7 , then the space of multisymplectic structures of degree $3 \leq k \leq n - 3$ is residual. However there is no a local classification of multisymplectic forms, not even in the linear case.

3 The graded Lie algebra of infinitesimal automorphisms of a multisymplectic manifold

From now on (M, Ω) will be a multisymplectic manifold.

A *multisymplectic diffeomorphism* is a diffeomorphism $\varphi: M \rightarrow M$ such that $\varphi^*\Omega = \Omega$. A *locally Hamiltonian vector field* on (M, Ω) is a vector field X whose flow consists of multisymplectic diffeomorphisms. It is clear that X is a locally Hamiltonian vector field iff $L(X)\Omega = 0$, or equivalently, iff $i(X)\Omega$ is a closed $(k-1)$ -form. This facts leads to the following generalization:

Definition 2 Let $X \in \mathfrak{X}^m(M)$ ($m \geq 1$).

1. X is said to be a Hamiltonian m -multivector field iff $i(X)\Omega$ is an exact $(k-m)$ -form; that is, there exists $\zeta \in \Omega^{k-m-1}(M)$ such that

$$i(X)\Omega = d\zeta \quad (1)$$

2. X is said to be a locally Hamiltonian m -multivector field iff $i(X)\Omega$ is a closed $(k-m)$ -form. In this case, for every point $x \in M$, there is an open neighbourhood $W \subset M$ and $\zeta \in \Omega^{k-m-1}(U)$ such that

$$i(X)\Omega = d\zeta \quad (\text{on } W)$$

In any case, ζ is defined modulo closed $(k-m-1)$ -forms. The class of $(k-m-1)$ -forms defined by ζ is said to be the *(local) Hamiltonian* for X and an element ζ in this class is said to be a *local Hamiltonian form* for X . Conversely, $\zeta \in \Omega^p(M)$ is said to be a *Hamiltonian p -form* iff there exist a $(k-p-1)$ -multivector field $X \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ such that (1) holds.

Remarks:

- If $m > k$ the previous definitions are void and all m -multivector fields are Hamiltonian.
- There are no Hamiltonian forms of degree higher than $k-2$.
- Any m -multivector field X lying in $\ker^m \Omega$ is a Hamiltonian multivector field with Hamiltonian form the zero form.
- Locally Hamiltonian multivector fields X of degree $k-1$ define closed 1-forms $i(X)\Omega$, which locally define a smooth function f (up to constants) called the *local Hamiltonian function* of X .

The following Lemma follows immediately from the previous considerations.

Lemma 1 Let $\Omega \in \Omega^k(M)$ be a closed m -nondegenerate form.

1. For every differentiable form $\zeta \in \Omega^{m-1}(M)$ such that $\binom{n}{m} \leq \binom{n}{k-m}$, there exists a $(k-m)$ -locally Hamiltonian multivector field X possessing it as local Hamiltonian form, i.e. such that $i(X)\Omega = d\zeta$. As a consequence, the differentials of Hamiltonian $(m-1)$ -forms of locally Hamiltonian $(k-m)$ -multivector fields span locally the m -multicotangent bundle of M , $\Lambda^m(T^*M)$.

2. If $\binom{n}{m} \leq \binom{n}{k-m}$ the family of locally Hamiltonian $(k-m)$ -multivector fields span locally the $(k-m)$ -multitangent bundle of M , this is

$$\Lambda^{k-m}(T_x M) = \text{span}\{X_x \mid L(X)\Omega = 0, X \in \mathfrak{X}^{k-m}(M)\}.$$

(Proof)

1. Let Ω be m -nondegenerate of degree k . The map $\hat{\Omega}_{k-m}$ has its rank in the bundle $\Lambda^m(T^*M)$, but $\hat{\Omega}_{k-m}$ is the dual map of $\hat{\Omega}_m$ (up to, perhaps, a minus sign). And as $\hat{\Omega}_m$ is a monomorphism, then $\pm\hat{\Omega}_m^* = \hat{\Omega}_{k-m}: \Lambda^{k-m}(TM) \rightarrow \Lambda^m(T^*M)$ is onto. Then, for every $\zeta \in \Omega^{m-1}(M)$, $d\zeta$ defines a section of $\Lambda^m(T^*M)$, hence we can choose a smooth $(k-m)$ -multivector field X such that $\hat{\Omega}_{k-m}(x)(X_x) = d\zeta(x)$, for every $x \in M$.

Taking a family of coordinate functions x^i , the same can be done locally for a family of $(m-1)$ -forms $x^{i_1}dx^{i_2} \wedge \dots \wedge dx^{i_m}$, showing in this way that the differentials of Hamiltonians $(m-1)$ -forms span locally the m -multicotangent bundle of M .

2. For every $X \in \mathfrak{X}^{k-m}(M)$, $i(X)\Omega \in \Omega^m(M)$. But, taking into account the above item, for every $x \in M$, there exists a neighbourhood $U \subset M$ such that $i(X)\Omega|_U = f^i d\zeta_i$, where $f^i \in C^\infty(U)$ and $\zeta_i \in \Omega^{m-1}(M)$ with $i(X_i)\Omega|_U = d\zeta_i$ for some locally Hamiltonian $(k-m)$ -multivector fields X_i . Therefore $X|_U = f^i X_i + Z$, with $Z \in \ker^{k-m}\Omega$; that is, $i(Z)\Omega = 0$, so Z are also locally Hamiltonian $(k-m)$ -multivector fields and the proof is finished. ■

Notice that for $m = 1$, if $k \geq 2$, then $n = \binom{n}{1} \leq \binom{n}{k-1}$. Thus if Ω is 1-nondegenerate, the above Lemma states that the differentials of Hamiltonian functions of locally Hamiltonian $(k-1)$ -multivector fields span locally the cotangent bundle of M and that, on its turn, the family of these $(k-1)$ -Hamiltonian multivector fields span locally the $(k-1)$ -multitangent bundle of M . However the previous Lemma says nothing about the Hamiltonian vector fields. We will analyze this question in the following Section.

It is immediate to prove that, as for locally Hamiltonian vector fields in symplectic manifolds, we have the following characterization:

Proposition 1 *A m -multivector field $X \in \mathfrak{X}^m(M)$ is a locally Hamiltonian m -multivector field if, and only if, $L(X)\Omega = 0$. Moreover, if X, Y are locally Hamiltonian multivector fields, then $[X, Y]$ is a Hamiltonian multivector field with Hamiltonian form $i(X \wedge Y)\Omega$.*

(Proof) In fact, if X, Y are multivector fields of degrees l, m respectively we have,

$$L([X, Y])\Omega = L(X)L(Y)\Omega - (-1)^{l+m}L(Y)L(X)\Omega = 0.$$

Moreover, $i([X, Y])\Omega = L(X)i(Y)\Omega - (-1)^{l+m}i(Y)L(X)\Omega = d(i(X)i(Y)\Omega)$. ■

We will denote respectively by $\mathfrak{X}_h^m(M)$ and $\mathfrak{X}_{lh}^m(M)$ the sets of Hamiltonian and locally Hamiltonian m -multivector fields in M . It is clear by the previous proposition that

$\bigoplus_{m \geq 0} \mathfrak{X}_{lh}^m(M)$ is a graded Lie subalgebra of the graded Lie algebra of multivector fields. We will say that a m -multivector field is *characteristic* if it lies in $\ker^m \Omega$. The set of characteristic fields constitute a graded Lie subalgebra of $\bigoplus_{m \geq 0} \mathfrak{X}_{lh}^m(M)$. Moreover, the characteristic multivector fields define a graded ideal of the graded Lie algebra of Hamiltonian multivector fields. We will denote the corresponding quotient graded Lie algebra by $\mathcal{V}_H^*(M, \Omega)$, and

$$\mathcal{V}_H^*(M, \Omega) = \bigoplus_{m \geq 0} \mathcal{V}_H^m(M, \Omega) \quad , \quad \mathcal{V}_H^m(M, \Omega) = \mathfrak{X}_{lh}^m(M) / \Gamma(\ker \hat{\Omega}_m).$$

Notice that again if $m > k$, $\ker^m \Omega = \Lambda^m(TM)$, hence $\mathcal{V}_H^m(M, \Omega) = 0$ and $\mathcal{V}_H^1(M, \Omega) = \mathfrak{X}_{lh}(M)$. Namely,

$$\mathcal{V}_H^*(M, \Omega) = \bigoplus_{m=0}^k \mathcal{V}_H^m(M, \Omega).$$

Definition 3 *The Lie algebra $\mathcal{V}_H^*(M, \Omega)$ will be called the infinitesimal graded Lie algebra of (M, Ω) or the graded Lie algebra of infinitesimal automorphisms of (M, Ω) .*

We can translate this structure of graded Lie algebra to the corresponding Hamiltonian forms in a similar way as it is done in symplectic geometry (see [9] for more details on this construction).

We will denote by $\mathcal{H}^p(M)$ the set of Hamiltonian p -forms in M and by $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}^p(M)$ the set of Hamiltonian p -forms modulo closed p -forms, $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}^p(M) = \mathcal{H}^p(M) / Z^p(M)$. The classes in $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}^p(M)$ will be denoted by $\bar{\zeta}$, meaning by that the class containing the Hamiltonian p -form ζ . Let $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}^*(M) := \bigoplus_{p \geq 0} \tilde{\mathcal{H}}^p(M)$. We can then define a graded Lie bracket on $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}^*(M)$.

Definition 4 *Let $\bar{\xi} \in \mathcal{H}^p(M)$, $\bar{\zeta} \in \mathcal{H}^m(M)$ and $X_\xi \in \mathfrak{X}_h^{k-p-1}(M)$, $Y_\zeta \in \mathfrak{X}_h^{k-m-1}(M)$ their corresponding Hamiltonian multivector fields modulo $\Gamma(\ker \hat{\Omega}_*)$. The bracket of these Hamiltonian classes (related to the multisymplectic structure Ω) is the $(p+m-k+2)$ -Hamiltonian class $\{\bar{\xi}, \bar{\zeta}\}$ containing the form,*

$$\{\xi, \zeta\} := \Omega(X_\xi, Y_\zeta) = i(Y_\zeta)i(X_\xi)\Omega = i(Y_\zeta)d\xi = (-1)^{(k-p-1)(k-m-1)}i(X_\xi)d\zeta$$

It is an easy exercise to check that $\{\bar{\xi}, \bar{\zeta}\}$ is well defined. In the same way that in the symplectic case the Poisson bracket is closely related to the Lie bracket, now we have:

Proposition 2 *Let $X_\xi \in \mathfrak{X}_h^p(M)$, $Y_\zeta \in \mathfrak{X}_h^m(M)$ Hamiltonian multivector fields and $\bar{\xi} \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}^{k-p-1}(M)$, $\bar{\zeta} \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}^{k-m-1}(M)$ the corresponding Hamiltonian classes. Then the Schouten-Nijenhuis bracket $[X_\xi, Y_\zeta]$ is a Hamiltonian $(p+m-1)$ -multivector field whose Hamiltonian $(k-p-m-2)$ -form is $\{\zeta, \xi\}$; that is,*

$$X_{\{\zeta, \xi\}} = [X_\xi, Y_\zeta]$$

(Proof) By definition

$$i(X_{\{\zeta, \xi\}})\Omega = d\{\zeta, \xi\}$$

On the other hand, because of Prop. 1

$$i([X_\xi, Y_\zeta])\Omega = di(X_\xi)i(Y_\zeta)\Omega = d\{\zeta, \xi\} \quad (2)$$

Thus

$$i(X_{\{\zeta, \xi\}})\Omega = i([X_\xi, Y_\zeta])\Omega$$

and therefore $X_{\{\zeta, \xi\}} = [X_\xi, Y_\zeta]$. ■

As a consequence of this we have:

Theorem 3 $(\tilde{\mathcal{H}}^*(M), \{ , \})$ is a graded Lie algebra whose grading is defined by $|\bar{\eta}| = k - p - 1$ if η is a p -Hamiltonian form.

Remarks:

- The center of the graded Lie algebra $(\tilde{\mathcal{H}}^*(M), \{ , \})$ is a graded Lie subalgebra, whose elements will be called Casimirs. We must point it out that there are no Casimirs of degree 0, i.e., functions commuting with anything, because if this were the case, then there will be a function S such that

$$\{S, \eta\} = 0,$$

for all Hamiltonian forms η . In particular, S will commute with $(k - 1)$ -Hamiltonian forms, but this implies that $X(S) = 0$, for all Hamiltonian vector fields. But this is clearly impossible, because Hamiltonian vector fields span the tangent bundle by Lemma 3.

- The graded Lie algebra $\mathcal{V}_H^*(M, \Omega)$ possesses as elements of degree zero the Lie algebra of locally Hamiltonian vector fields on (M, Ω) which is the Lie algebra of the ILH-group [28] of smooth multisymplectic diffeomorphisms. This suggests the possibility of embracing in a single structure of supergroup both smooth multisymplectic diffeomorphisms and infinitesimal automorphisms of a multisymplectic manifold (M, Ω) . This can certainly be done extending to the graded setting some of the techniques used to deal with ILH-Lie groups.

4 Locally homogeneous multisymplectic manifolds. The group of multisymplectic diffeomorphisms

As it was mentioned earlier, in general, it is not true that the locally Hamiltonian vector fields in a multisymplectic manifold span the tangent bundle of this manifold. However, there are a simple property, that was already mentioned in the introduction, that implies it (among other things).

Definition 5 Let M be a differential manifold. Consider a point $x \in M$, and a compact set K such that $x \in \overset{\circ}{K}$.

1. A local Liouville vector field at x is a vector field Δ^x which verifies that $\text{supp } \Delta^x := \overline{\{y \in M \mid \Delta^x(y) \neq 0\}}$ is contained in K , and there exists a diffeomorphism $\varphi: \text{supp } \Delta^x \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\varphi_* \Delta^x = \Delta$, where $\Delta = x^i \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}$ is the standard Liouville or dilation vector field in $\mathbb{R}^n$.
2. A differential form $\Omega \in \Omega^k(M)$ is said to be locally homogeneous at x if there exists a local Liouville vector field Δ^x at x , such that

$$L(\Delta^x)\Omega = c\Omega \quad , \quad c \in \mathbb{R} \quad (3)$$

Ω is locally homogeneous if it is locally homogeneous for all $x \in M$.

A couple (M, Ω) , where M is a manifold and $\Omega \in \Omega^k(M)$ is locally homogeneous is said to be a locally homogeneous manifold.

Notice that the last property implies that, for every point $x \in M$, there exists a neighbourhood B of x , with a local Liouville vector field, such that $\text{supp } \Delta^x = B$.

Clearly, symplectic and volume forms are locally homogeneous. It is important to remark that, apart from these ones, multicotangent bundles are *locally homogeneous multisymplectic manifolds*. In fact, let $\alpha_0 \in \Lambda^k(T^*Q)$, and consider local natural coordinates $(x^i, p_{i_1, \dots, i_k})$ in a small neighbourhood of α_0 . We define $r^2 := \sum_i (x^i)^2 + \sum_i (p_{i_1, \dots, i_k})^2$, and $\lambda \equiv \lambda(r^2)$ a bump function. Then consider the local Liouville vector field $\Delta_\lambda := \lambda \Delta$. Therefore, a straightforward calculation shows that, for the natural multisymplectic form $\Omega \in \Omega^{k+1}(\Lambda^k(T^*Q))$,

$$L(\Delta_\lambda)\Omega = [\lambda + 2\lambda'(r^2)]\Omega$$

Nevertheless, not all the multisymplectic manifolds are locally homogeneous. A simple example of such situation is provided by $(\mathbb{R}^7, \Omega)$, where $\Omega \in \Omega^3(\mathbb{R}^7)$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega = & dx^1 \wedge dx^2 \wedge dx^3 + dx^1 \wedge dx^4 \wedge dx^5 + dx^1 \wedge dx^6 \wedge dx^7 \\ & + dx^2 \wedge dx^4 \wedge dx^6 - dx^2 \wedge dx^5 \wedge dx^7 - dx^3 \wedge dx^4 \wedge dx^7 - dx^3 \wedge dx^5 \wedge dx^6 \end{aligned}$$

This form is analyzed in [8], and it is shown that the group of its multisymplectic diffeomorphisms is G_2 . As it is seen in [22], this fact contradicts the local homogeneity of $(\mathbb{R}^7, \Omega)$.

At this point, we can show that Hamiltonian vector fields in locally homogeneous multisymplectic manifolds can be localized. This property plays a crucial role in the discussion to follow.

Lemma 2 *Let X be a locally Hamiltonian vector field on a locally homogeneous multisymplectic manifold (M, Ω) . Let x be a point in M , then there exist neighborhoods V, U of x such that $V \subset \bar{V} \subset U$, $\bar{V}$ compact, and a locally Hamiltonian vector field X' such that X' coincides with X in V and X' vanishes outside of U .*

(*Proof*) Let X be a locally Hamiltonian vector field on (M, Ω) , i.e., $i(X)\Omega = \eta$ with η a closed $(k-1)$ -form. We shall follow a deformation technique used to show that certain forms are isomorphic [27] in a similar way as it is applied to prove Poincaré's lemma. Let x be a point in M . We shall choose a contractible neighborhood U of x (if necessary we can shrink it to be contained in a coordinate chart). Let ρ_t be a smooth isotopy defining a strong deformation retraction from U to x , i.e., $\rho_0 = id$, and ρ_1 maps U onto x . Let Δ_t be the time-dependent vector field whose flow is given by ρ_t , i.e.,

$$\frac{d}{dt}\rho_t = \Delta_t \circ \rho_t.$$

Then,

$$\frac{d}{dt}(\rho_t^*\eta) = \rho_t^*(L(\Delta_t)\eta),$$

hence,

$$\rho_1^*\eta - \rho_0^*\eta = \int_0^1 \frac{d}{dt}(\rho_t^*\eta) dt = \int_0^1 \rho_t^*(L(\Delta_t)\eta) dt = d \int_0^1 \rho_t^*(i(\Delta_t)\eta) dt, \quad (4)$$

thus,

$$\eta = -d \int_0^1 \rho_t^*(i(\Delta_t)\eta) dt,$$

and in U , $\eta = d\zeta$ with $\zeta = - \int_0^1 \rho_t^*(i(\Delta_t)\eta) dt$.

We will localize the vector field X by using a bump function λ centered at x , i.e., we shall choose λ such that $V = \text{supp } \lambda$ will be a compact set K contained in U . Unfortunately the vector field λX is not locally Hamiltonian, hence we will proceed modifying the Hamiltonian form ζ of X instead. As M is locally homogeneous at x , we can define a new vector field Δ'_t by scaling the vector field Δ_t by λ , i.e.,

$$\Delta'_t = \lambda \Delta_t.$$

We will denote the flow of Δ'_t by ρ'_t . It is clear that the subbundle E_1 is invariant by the flow ρ'_t of Δ'_t . In fact, if $\zeta \in E_1$, then there is v such that $i(v)\Omega = \zeta$. Thus, $\rho'_t{}^*\zeta = \rho'_t{}^*(i(v)\Omega) = i(\rho'_{t*}v)(\rho'_t{}^*\Omega) \circ \rho'_t$. But, as a consequence of (3), we have that $\rho'_t{}^*\Omega = f_t\Omega$, for some f_t . Hence $\rho'_t{}^*\zeta \in E_1$. Moreover, we can choose the function λ such that $\Delta_t(\lambda) = r(t)$ and,

$$r(t) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } 0 \leq t \leq 1/3 \\ r(t) & \text{is a positive function such that } \frac{d}{dt}r(t) > 0 \text{ if } 1/3 < t < 2/3 \\ 1 & \text{if } 2/3 \leq t \leq 1 \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

hence, as the flow $(\rho'_t)^*$ leaves invariant the subbundle $E_1 = \hat{\Omega}_1(TM)$, we have that $(\rho'_t)^*\eta \in E_1$ for all $0 \leq t \leq 1$. Again, repeating the computation leading to eq. (4), and using the vector field Δ'_t instead, we get,

$$(\rho'_1)^*\eta - (\rho'_0)^*\eta = d \int_0^1 (\rho'_t)^*(\lambda i(\Delta_t)\eta) dt. \quad (6)$$

As in the undeformed situation ($\lambda = 1$), $\rho'_0 = Id$, but ρ'_1 is not a retraction of U onto x . The $(k-1)$ -form $\eta' = -d \int_0^1 (\rho'_t)^*(\lambda i(\Delta_t)\eta) dt$ is in E_1 , because both, $(\rho'_1)^*\eta$ and $(\rho'_0)^*\eta$, are in E_1 , thus there exists a vector field X' such that

$$i(X')\Omega = \eta'.$$

The form η' is closed by construction, hence X' is locally Hamiltonian.

Moreover, if y is a point lying in the set $\lambda^{-1}(1) \subset V$ then, $\rho'_s(y) = \rho_s(y)$. Consequently, from eq. (6), $\eta'(y) = \eta(y)$ and $X'(y) = X(y)$. If y on the contrary lies outside the compact set K , we have $\rho'_t(y) = y$ for all t because λ vanishes there, thus Δ'_t vanishes and the flow is the identity. Then $\eta'(y) = 0$ and $X'(y) = 0$. $\blacksquare$

A far reaching consequence of the localization lemma is the transitivity of the group of multisymplectic diffeomorphisms. We will first proof the following result.

Lemma 3 *Let (M, Ω) be a locally homogeneous multisymplectic manifold. Then the family of locally Hamiltonian vector fields span locally the tangent bundle of M , this is*

$$T_x M = \text{span}\{X_x \mid X \in \mathfrak{X}(M), L(X)\Omega = 0\}. \quad (7)$$

(*Proof*) We will work locally. Let U be a contractible open neighborhood of a given point $x \in M$. We can shrink U to be contained in a coordinate chart with coordinates x^i . The tensor bundles of M restricted to U are trivial. In particular the subbundle E_1 restricted to U is trivial. Let $v \in T_x M$ an arbitrary tangent vector. Let $\nu = \hat{\Omega}_1(x)v \in E_1 \subset \Lambda^{k-1}(T_x^* M)$. Consider a vector field X on U such that $X(x) = v$. Then $i(X)\Omega = \eta$ and the $(k-1)$ -form η is not closed in general. We shall consider as in Lemma 2 a strong deformation retraction ρ_t and the corresponding vector field Δ_t . Now on one hand we have,

$$\int_0^1 \frac{d}{ds}(\rho_s^* \eta) ds = -\eta,$$

and on the other hand,

$$\int_0^1 \frac{d}{ds}(\rho_s^* \eta) ds = d \int_0^1 \rho_s^*(i(\Delta_s)\eta) ds + \int_0^1 \rho_s^*(i(\Delta_s)d\eta) ds, \quad (8)$$

but, because, $d\eta = di(X)\Omega = L(X)\Omega$, then

$$i(\Delta_t)d\eta = i(\Delta_t)L(X)\Omega = i([\Delta_t, X])\Omega + L(X)i(\Delta_t)\Omega.$$

Thus, returning to eq. (8), we obtain,

$$-\eta = d \int_0^1 \rho_s^* i(\Delta_s)\eta ds + \int_0^1 \rho_s^*(i([\Delta_s, X])\Omega + L(X)i(\Delta_s)\Omega) ds.$$

Choosing the vector field X such that its flow leaves E_1 invariant the second term on the r.h.s. of the previous equation will be in E_1 , hence the first term will be in E_1 too. Let us define $\eta' = -d \left(\int_0^1 \rho_s^* i(\Delta_s)\eta ds \right)$, and let us denote by X' the hamiltonian vector field on U defined by

$$i(X')\Omega = \eta'.$$

Evaluating η' at x we find that $\eta'(x) = \eta(x)$, hence $X'(x) = v$. Then, we localize the vector field X' in such a way that the closure of its support is compact and is contained in U . Then, we can extend this vector field trivially to all M and this extension is locally Hamiltonian. Finally the value of this vector field at x is precisely v . $\blacksquare$

We shall recall that a group of diffeomorphisms G is said to act r -transitively on M if for any pair of collections $\{x_1, \dots, x_r\}$, $\{y_1, \dots, y_r\}$ of distinct points of M , there exists a diffeomorphism $\phi \in G$ such that $\phi(x_i) = y_i$. If the group G acts transitively for all r , then it is said to act ω -transitively or transitively for short. The transitivity of a group of diffeomorphisms can be reduced to a local problem because (strong) local transitivity implies transitivity. More precisely, we will say that the group of diffeomorphisms G is strongly locally transitive on M if for each $x \in M$ and a neighborhood U of x , there are neighborhoods V and W of x with $\bar{V} \subset W \subset \bar{W} \subset U$, $\bar{W}$ compact, such that for any $y \in V$ there is a smooth isotopy ϕ_t on G joining ϕ with the identity, $\phi_1 = \phi$, $\phi_0 = id$, such that $\phi_1(x) = y$ and ϕ_t leaves fixed every point outside $\bar{W}$. Then, if G is strongly locally transitive on M , then G acts transitively on M [7].

Theorem 4 *The group of multisymplectic diffeomorphisms $G(M, \Omega)$ of a locally homogeneous multisymplectic manifold is strongly locally transitive on M .*

(*Proof*) By Lemma 3 we can construct a local basis of the tangent bundle in the neighborhood of a given point x made of locally Hamiltonian vector fields X_i . Using Lemma 2 we can localize the vector fields X_i in such a way that the localized Hamiltonian vector fields X'_i will have common supports. We will denote this common support by V and we can assume that it will be contained in a compact subset contained in U . But the vector fields X'_i will generate the module of vector fields inside the support V , hence the flows of local vectors fields cover the same set as the flows of local Hamiltonian vector fields, but the group of diffeomorphisms is locally strongly transitive and the same will happen for the group of multisymplectic diffeomorphisms. ■

Corollary 1 *The group of multisymplectic diffeomorphisms $G(M, \Omega)$ of a locally homogeneous multisymplectic manifold (M, Ω) acts transitively on M .*

(*Proof*) The conclusion follows from the results in [7] and Thm. 4. ■

5 Invariant differential forms

In order to prove the main statement in this section, we will establish first two lemmas:

Lemma 4 *Let (M, Ω) be a multisymplectic manifold of degree k and $\alpha \in \Omega^p(M)$ (with $p \geq k - 1$) a differential form which is invariant under the set of locally Hamiltonian $(k - 1)$ -multivector fields, that is, $L(X)\alpha = 0$, for every $X \in \mathfrak{X}_{lh}^{k-1}(M)$. Then:*

1. *For every $X, Y \in \mathfrak{X}_{lh}^{k-1}(M)$,*

$$i(X)\Omega \wedge i(Y)\alpha + i(Y)\Omega \wedge i(X)\alpha = 0 \quad (9)$$

2. In particular, for every $X \in \mathfrak{X}_{lh}^{k-1}(M)$ with $i(X)\Omega = 0$ (that is, $X \in \ker^{k-1}\Omega$), then

$$i(X)\alpha = 0 \quad (10)$$

(Proof)

1. Since α is invariant under $\mathfrak{X}_{lh}^{k-1}(M)$, for every $X \in \mathfrak{X}_{lh}^{k-1}(M)$ we have $L(X)\alpha = 0$, then,

$$di(X)\alpha = (-1)^{k-1}i(X)d\alpha \quad (11)$$

Let $X, Y \in \mathfrak{X}_{lh}^{k-1}(M)$, for every $x \in M$ there exists an open neighbourhood of it, $U \subset M$, and $f, g \in C^\infty(U)$ such that $i(X)\Omega \stackrel{U}{=} df$ and $i(Y)\Omega \stackrel{U}{=} dg$ (from now on we will write $X|_U \equiv X_f$ and $Y|_U \equiv X_g$). Then, consider the locally Hamiltonian vector field $X_h \in \mathfrak{X}_{lh}^{k-1}(U)$ whose expression in U is $X_h \stackrel{U}{=} fX_g + gX_f$; its Hamiltonian function in U is $h = fg \in C^\infty(U)$ since

$$i(X_h)\Omega \stackrel{U}{=} i(fX_g + gX_f)\Omega = fi(X_g)\Omega + gi(X_f)\Omega = f dg + g df = dh$$

Hence

$$i(X_h)\alpha \stackrel{U}{=} fi(X_g)\alpha + gi(X_f)\alpha$$

and then

$$di(X_h)\alpha \stackrel{U}{=} df \wedge i(X_g)\alpha + f di(X_g)\alpha + dg \wedge i(X_f)\alpha + g di(X_f)\alpha$$

But, taking into account (11),

$$di(X_h)\alpha \stackrel{U}{=} f((-1)^{k-1}i(X_g)d\alpha) + g((-1)^{k-1}i(X_f)d\alpha) = f di(X_g)\alpha + g di(X_f)\alpha$$

and comparing both results we conclude

$$df \wedge i(X_g)\alpha + dg \wedge i(X_f)\alpha \stackrel{U}{=} 0 \quad (12)$$

which is the local expression of equation (9).

2. Taking $X \in \ker^{k-1}\Omega$ in (9), the equation (12) gives $i(Y)\Omega \wedge i(X)\Omega = 0$ for every Y . But because of Lemma 1, this implies that,

$$dg \wedge i(X)\alpha \stackrel{U}{=} 0$$

for every $g \in C^\infty(U)$; hence, $i(X)\alpha = 0$, for every $X \in \ker^{k-1}\Omega$. ■

Lemma 5 *Let (M, Ω) be a multisymplectic manifold of degree k and $\alpha \in \Omega^p(M)$ a differential form which is invariant under the set of locally Hamiltonian $(k-1)$ -multivector fields. Then:*

1. If $p = k - 1$ then $\alpha = 0$.

2. If $p = k$, there exists a unique $\alpha' \in C^\infty(M)$ such that

$$i(X)\alpha = \alpha' i(X)\Omega$$

for every $X \in \mathfrak{X}_{lh}^{k-1}(M)$.

(Proof) The starting point is the equality (9). Taking $X = Y \notin \ker^{k-1} \Omega$ (if $X \in \ker^{k-1} \Omega$ then $i(X)\alpha = 0$ by hypothesis), we obtain

$$i(X)\Omega \wedge i(X)\alpha = 0 \tag{13}$$

for every $X \in \mathfrak{X}_{lh}^{k-1}(M)$. Therefore we have:

1. If $p = k - 1$ then $i(X)\alpha \in C^\infty(M)$ and, according to the first item of Lemma 1 (for 1-nondegenerate forms), (13), together with (10), leads to the result $i(X)\alpha = 0$, for every $X \in \mathfrak{X}_{lh}^{k-1}(M)$. But, taking into account the item 2 of Lemma 1 (for 1-nondegenerate forms), this holds also for every $X \in \mathfrak{X}^{k-1}(M)$ and we must conclude that $\alpha = 0$.
2. If $p = k$ and $i(X)\alpha = 0$ for all X , then, $\alpha = 0$. Thus, let us assume that $i(X)\Omega \neq 0$ for some X , then the solution of eq. (13) is

$$i(X)\alpha = \alpha'_X i(X)\Omega \tag{14}$$

and it is important to point out that the equation (10) for α implies that the function $\alpha'_X \in C^\infty(M)$ is the same for every $X, X' \in \mathfrak{X}_{lh}^{k-1}(M)$ such that $i(X)\Omega = i(X')\Omega$.

Now, returning to equation (9) we obtain the relation

$$i(Y)\Omega \wedge i(X)\Omega(\alpha'_X - \alpha'_Y) = 0$$

But $\alpha'_X, \alpha'_Y \in C^\infty(M)$ are the unique solution of the respective equations (13) for each $X, Y \in \mathfrak{X}_{lh}^{k-1}(M)$; then we have the following options:

- If $i(Y)\Omega \wedge i(X)\Omega \neq 0$ then $\alpha'_X = \alpha'_Y$.
- If $i(Y)\Omega \wedge i(X)\Omega = 0$ then $X = fY + Z$, where $f \in C^\infty(M)$ and $Z \in \ker^{k-1} \Omega$.
Therefore:
 - If $X \in \ker^{k-1} \Omega$ then $Y \in \ker^{k-1} \Omega$. Therefore, taking into account the item 2 of lemma 4, the corresponding equations (14) for X and Y are identities and, thus, α'_X and α'_Y are arbitrary functions which we can take to be equal.
 - If $X \notin \ker^{k-1} \Omega$ then $Y \notin \ker^{k-1} \Omega$. Therefore, taking into account the item 2 of lemma 4, we have

$$\begin{aligned} i(X)\alpha &= i(fY + Z)\alpha = fi(Y)\alpha \\ &= f\alpha'_Y i(Y)\Omega = \alpha'_Y i(fY + Z)\Omega = \alpha'_Y i(X)\Omega \end{aligned}$$

which, comparing with (14), gives $\alpha'_X = \alpha'_Y$:

In any case $\alpha'_X = \alpha'_Y$ and, as a consequence, the function α' solution of (13) is the same for every $X \in \mathfrak{X}_{lh}^{k-1}(M)$. ■

At this point we can state and prove the following fundamental result:

Theorem 5 *Let (M, Ω) be a locally homogeneous multisymplectic manifold and $\alpha \in \Omega^p(M)$, with $p = k - 1, k$ a differential form which is invariant by the set of locally Hamiltonian $(k - 1)$ -multivector fields and the set of locally Hamiltonian vector fields; that is, $L(X)\alpha = 0$ and $L(Z)\alpha = 0$, for every $X \in \mathfrak{X}_{lh}^{k-1}(M)$ and $Z \in \mathfrak{X}_{lh}(M)$. Then we have:*

1. *If $p = k$ then $\alpha = c\Omega$, with $c \in \mathbb{R}$.*
2. *If $p = k - 1$ then $\alpha = 0$.*

(Proof)

1. First suppose that $p = k$.

For every $X \in \mathfrak{X}_{lh}^{k-1}(M)$, according to Lemma 5 (item 2), we have

$$i(X)\alpha = \alpha' i(X)\Omega = i(X)(\alpha'\Omega)$$

where $\alpha' \in C^\infty(M)$ is the same function for every $X \in \mathfrak{X}_{lh}^{k-1}(M)$. But, taking into account the item 2 of Lemma 1 (for 1-nondegenerate forms), the above equality holds for every $X \in \mathfrak{X}^{k-1}(M)$ and thus $\alpha = \alpha'\Omega$.

Then, for every $Z \in \mathfrak{X}_{lh}(M)$, by hypothesis

$$0 = L(Z)\alpha = (L(Z)\alpha')\Omega.$$

Hence $L(Z)\alpha' = 0$, but because of Lemma 3, locally Hamiltonian vector fields span the tangent space, thus $\alpha' = c$ (constant). So

$$i(X)\alpha = ci(X)\Omega = i(X)(c\Omega)$$

and, taking into account the item 2 of Lemma 1 (for 1-nondegenerate forms) again, this relation holds also for every $X \in \mathfrak{X}^{k-1}(M)$, therefrom we have to conclude that $\alpha = c\Omega$.

2. If $p = k - 1$ the result follows straightforwardly from the first item of the lemma 5. ■

Remarks:

- From Thm. 5 it follows immediately Thm. 2.
- Another immediate consequence of this theorem is that, if $\alpha \in \Omega^k(M)$ is a differential form invariant by the sets of locally Hamiltonian $(k - 1)$ -multivector fields and locally Hamiltonian vector fields, then it is invariant also by the set of locally Hamiltonian m -multivector fields, for $1 < m < k - 1$.
- As it is evident, if $k = 2$ we have proved (partially) the classical *Lee Hwa Chung's theorem* for symplectic manifolds.

6 Characterization of multisymplectic transformations

Now we are going to use the theorems above in order to give several characterization of multisymplectic transformations in the same way as Lee Hwa Chung's theorem allows to characterize symplectomorphisms in the symplectic case [21, 24, 17].

A vector field X on a multisymplectic manifold (M, Ω) will be said to be a *conformal Hamiltonian vector field* iff there exists a function σ such that

$$L(X)\Omega = \sigma\Omega. \quad (15)$$

It is immediate to check that, if $\Omega^r \neq 0$, $r > 1$, then σ must be constant. Then:

Definition 6 *A diffeomorphism $\varphi: M_1 \rightarrow M_2$ between the multisymplectic manifolds (M_i, Ω_i) , $i = 1, 2$, is said to be a special conformal multisymplectic diffeomorphism iff there exists $c \in \mathbf{R}$, such that $\varphi^*\Omega_2 = c\Omega_1$. The constant factor c will be called the scale or valence of φ .*

Therefore we will prove:

Theorem 6 *Let (M_i, Ω_i) , $i = 1, 2$, be two locally homogeneous multisymplectic manifolds. A diffeomorphism $\varphi: M_1 \rightarrow M_2$ is a special conformal multisymplectic diffeomorphism if, and only if, the differential map $\varphi_*: \mathfrak{X}(M_1) \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}(M_2)$ induces an isomorphism between the graded Lie algebras $\mathcal{V}_H^*(M_1, \Omega_1)$, $\mathcal{V}_H^*(M_2, \Omega_2)$. Then we will have that*

$$\varphi_*X_\xi = \frac{1}{c}X_{\varphi^{*-1}\xi}.$$

*In addition, if $X_1 \in \mathfrak{X}_h^m(M_1)$ is any Hamiltonian (resp. locally Hamiltonian) multivector field with $\xi_1 \in \Omega^{k-m-1}(M_1)$ a Hamiltonian form for it (resp. locally Hamiltonian in some $U_1 \subset M_1$), and $\varphi_*X_1 = X_2 \in \mathfrak{X}_{lh}^m(M_2)$ with Hamiltonian form $\xi_2 \in \Omega^{k-m-1}(M_2)$ (resp. locally Hamiltonian in $\varphi(U_1) = U_2 \subset M_2$); then*

$$c\xi_1 = \varphi^*\xi_2 + \eta \quad (16)$$

where $\eta \in \Omega^{k-m-1}(M_1)$ is a closed form. In other words, φ^ induces an isomorphism between classes of Hamiltonian forms.*

(Proof) Taking into account proposition 1 we have:

($\Leftarrow$) For every $X_1 \in \mathfrak{X}_h^m(M_1)$ (resp. $X_1 \in \mathfrak{X}_{lh}^m(M_1)$) we have that $\varphi_*X_1 = X_2 \in \mathfrak{X}_h^m(M_2)$ (resp. $X_2 \in \mathfrak{X}_{lh}^m(M_2)$). In any case $L(X_2)\Omega_2 = 0$, then we obtain

$$0 = \varphi^*L(X_2)\Omega_2 = L(\varphi_*^{-1}X_2)\varphi^*\Omega_2 = L(X_1)\varphi^*\Omega_2$$

therefore, by theorem 5, we have that $\varphi^*\Omega_2 = c\Omega_1$.

($\implies$) Conversely, for every $X_{\xi_1} \in \mathfrak{X}_h^m(M_1)$ we have that $i(X_{\xi_1})\Omega_1 - d\xi_1 = 0$. Then, since $\varphi^*\Omega_2 = c\Omega_1$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = \varphi^{*-1}(i(X_{\xi_1})\Omega_1 - d\xi_1) &= i(\varphi_*X_{\xi_1})\varphi^{*-1}\Omega_1 - \varphi^{*-1}d\xi_1 = \frac{1}{c}i(\varphi_*X_{\xi_1})\Omega_2 - d\varphi^{*-1}\xi_1 \\ &\Leftrightarrow i(\varphi_*X_{\xi_1})\Omega_2 - d\left(\frac{1}{c}\varphi^{*-1}\xi_1\right) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

so, $\varphi_*X_{\xi_1} = X_{\xi_2} \in \mathfrak{X}_h^m(M_2)$ and its Hamiltonian form $\xi_2 \in \Omega^{k-m-1}(M_2)$ is related with ξ_1 by Eq. (16).

In an analogous way, using φ^{-1} , we would prove that $\varphi_*^{-1}X_2 \in \mathfrak{X}_h^m(M_1)$, for every $X_2 \in \mathfrak{X}_h^m(M_2)$.

The proof for locally Hamiltonian multivector fields is obtained in the same way, working locally on $U_1 \subset M_1$ and $U_2 = \varphi(U_1) \subset M_2$. $\blacksquare$

As a consequence of the previous theorem there is another characterization of conformal multisymplectomorphisms.

Corollary 2 *Let (M_i, Ω_i) , $i = 1, 2$, be two locally homogeneous multisymplectic manifolds. A diffeomorphism $\varphi: M_1 \rightarrow M_2$ is a special conformal multisymplectic diffeomorphism if, and only if, for every $U_2 \subset M_2$ and for every $\xi_2 \in \Omega^p(U_2)$ and $\zeta_2 \in \Omega^m(U_2)$ ($p, m < k - 1$), we have*

$$\varphi^*\{\xi_2, \zeta_2\} = \frac{1}{c}\{\varphi^*\xi_2, \varphi^*\zeta_2\} \quad (17)$$

(*Proof*) Let $X_{\xi_2} \in \mathfrak{X}_h^{k-p-1}(M_2)$ and $Y_{\zeta_2} \in \mathfrak{X}_h^{k-m-1}(M_2)$ be Hamiltonian multivector fields having ξ_2 and ζ_2 as Hamiltonian forms in U_2 .

($\implies$) We have

$$\varphi^*\{\xi_2, \zeta_2\} = \varphi^*i(Y_{\zeta_2})d\xi_2 = i(\varphi_*^{-1}Y_{\zeta_2})\varphi^*d\xi_2 \quad (18)$$

but, if φ is a conformal multisymplectomorphism (of valence c), according to Thm. 6, $\varphi_*^{-1}Y_{\zeta_2} \in \mathfrak{X}_h^m(M_1)$ and

$$i(\varphi_*^{-1}Y_{\zeta_2})\Omega_1 = \frac{1}{c}d\varphi^*\zeta_2$$

that is, $\varphi_*^{-1}Y_{\zeta_2} = \frac{1}{c}Y_{\varphi^*\zeta_2}$. Therefore, because of eq. (18) we conclude

$$\varphi^*\{\xi_2, \zeta_2\} = i(\varphi_*^{-1}Y_{\zeta_2})\varphi^*d\xi_2 = \frac{1}{c}i(Y_{\varphi^*\zeta_2})\varphi^*d\xi_2 = \frac{1}{c}\{\varphi^*\xi_2, \varphi^*\zeta_2\}$$

($\Leftarrow$) Assuming that eq. (17) holds and using again the definition of Poisson bracket we can write it as

$$\varphi^*i(Y_{\zeta_2})d\xi_2 = i(\varphi_*^{-1}Y_{\zeta_2})\varphi^*d\xi_2 = \frac{1}{c}i(Y_{\varphi^*\zeta_2})\varphi^*d\xi_2$$

for every ξ_2 . Hence we conclude that

$$\varphi_*^{-1}Y_{\zeta_2} = \frac{1}{c}Y_{\varphi^*\zeta_2} \in \mathfrak{X}_h^m(M_1)$$

for every $Y_{\zeta_2} \in \mathfrak{X}_h^m(M_2)$ and because of Thm. 6 again, φ is a special conformal multisymplectomorphism. $\blacksquare$

7 Proof of the main Theorem

We will prove now theorem 1:

Let Φ be a group isomorphism from $G(M_1, \Omega_1)$ to $G(M_2, \Omega_2)$ which is in addition a homeomorphism if we endow $G(M_i, \Omega_i)$ with the point-open topology. Then, Corollary 1 implies that the group $G(M_i, \Omega_i)$ acts transitively on M_i , $i = 1, 2$, hence by the main theorem in [33] there exists a bijective map from M_1 to M_2 such that $\Phi(f) = \varphi \circ f \circ \varphi^{-1}$. Moreover the map φ is a conformal multisymplectic diffeomorphism if it verifies the conditions in Thm. 1 as the following argument shows.

- φ is a homeomorphism.

Let $\mathcal{A}(M)$ be the class of fixed subsets of $G(M, \Omega)$, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{A}(M) = \{ \text{Fix}(f) \mid f \in G(M, \Omega) \}, \quad \text{Fix}(f) = \{ x \in M \mid f(x) = x \}.$$

Let $\mathcal{B}(M)$ be the class of complements of elements of $\mathcal{A}(M)$, this is

$$\mathcal{B}(M) = \{ B = M - A \mid A \in \mathcal{A}(M) \},$$

hence, $\mathcal{B}(M)$ is a class of open subsets of M . If $B \in \mathcal{B}(M)$ we can construct a multisymplectic diffeomorphism g such that B is the interior of $\text{supp}(g)$. In fact, for any point $x \in M$ and a neighborhood U of x , it follows from Lemma 2 that there exists $B \in \mathcal{B}(M)$ such that $x \in B \subset U$. Thus, $\mathcal{B}(M)$ is a basis for the topology of M . Moreover, if $f \in G(M_1, \Omega_1)$, then $\text{Fix}(\varphi \circ f \circ \varphi^{-1}) = \varphi(\text{Fix}(f))$ and if $g \in G(M_2, \Omega_2)$, then $\text{Fix}(\varphi^{-1} \circ g \circ \varphi) = \varphi^{-1}(\text{Fix}(g))$. Hence, φ, φ^{-1} take basic open sets (in $\mathcal{B}(M)$) into basic open sets, thus they are both continuous, i.e., φ is a homeomorphism.

- φ is a smooth diffeomorphism.

To proof this we will adapt the proof in [32] and [3] to our setting. To prove that φ , and φ^{-1} are C^∞ it is enough to show that $h \circ \varphi \in C^\infty(M_1)$ for all $h \in C^\infty(M_2)$ and $k \circ \varphi^{-1} \in C^\infty(M_2)$ for all $k \in C^\infty(M_1)$.

Let $x \in M_1$ and U an open neighborhood of x which is the domain of a local coordinate chart $\psi: U \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^n$. According to Lemma 3, there exist Hamiltonian vector fields X_i , with compact supports on U , which are a local basis for the vector fields on an open neighborhood of x contained in U . Let ϕ_t^i the 1-parameter group of diffeomorphisms generated by X_i . Let now X be any locally Hamiltonian vector field on M_1 . We will localize it on a neighborhood of x in such way that its compact support will be contained in U . We will denote the localized vector field again by X . Let ϕ_t be 1-parameter group of multisymplectic diffeomorphisms generated by X (which exists because X is complete). For each t , $\Psi_t := \Phi(\phi_t) = \varphi \circ \phi_t \circ \varphi^{-1}$ is a C^∞ multisymplectic diffeomorphism. The evaluation map,

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi &: \mathbf{R} \times M_2 \longrightarrow M_2 \\ (t, x) &\longmapsto \Phi_t(x) = \Phi(\phi_t)(x) = \varphi \circ \phi_t \circ \varphi^{-1}(x) \end{aligned}$$

is continuous. Moreover $\Psi_0 = \text{Id}$ and $\Psi_{t+s} = \Psi_t \circ \Psi_s$. Therefore the map Ψ is a continuous action of $\mathbf{R}$ on M_2 by C^∞ diffeomorphisms. By Montgomery-Zippin theorem, since $\mathbf{R}$ is a Lie group, this action is C^∞ , i.e, Ψ is smooth in both variables t and x . Therefore, the 1-parameter group of multisymplectic diffeomorphisms Ψ_t has an infinitesimal generator, i.e., a C^∞ locally Hamiltonian vector field X_Ψ such that,

$$\frac{d}{dt}\Psi_t = X_\Psi \circ \Psi_t.$$

Given $h \in C^\infty(M_2)$, its directional derivative $X_\Psi(h)$ is a C^∞ function. For any $x \in M_1$ we have,

$$X_\Psi(h)(\varphi(x)) = \left. \frac{d}{dt} h(\Psi_t(\varphi(x))) \right|_{t=0} = \left. \frac{d}{dt} (h \circ \varphi)(\phi_t(x)) \right|_{t=0}.$$

Therefore if X is any of the Hamiltonian vector fields X_i above, for all y in a small neighborhood of x , the preceding formula gives

$$X_i(h \circ \varphi)(y) = \left. \frac{d}{dt} (h \circ \varphi)(\phi_t^i(y)) \right|_{t=0} = (X_i)_\Psi(h)(\varphi(y))$$

This formula shows that $h \circ \varphi$ is a C^1 -map and that for any locally Hamiltonian vector field X ,

$$(X_\Psi(h)) \circ \varphi = X(h \circ \varphi). \quad (19)$$

To compute higher partial derivatives, we just iterate this formula using the vector fields X_i , for instance,

$$(X_j)_\Psi((X_i)_\Psi(h)) \circ \varphi = X_j(X_i(h \circ \varphi)),$$

Since the Hamiltonian vector fields X_i are a local basis for the vector fields on an open neighborhood of x , we have proved that $h \circ \varphi \in C^\infty(M_1)$.

- φ_* maps locally Hamiltonian vector fields into locally Hamiltonian vector fields.

Equation (19) shows that $X_\Psi = \varphi_* X$ and because Ψ_t is a flow of multisymplectic diffeomorphisms, then $\varphi_* X$ is another locally Hamiltonian vector field. Thus, φ_* maps every locally Hamiltonian vector field into a locally Hamiltonian vector field.

- φ is a special conformal multisymplectic diffeomorphism.

We finally show that, with the additional hypothesis stated in Thm. 1, then $\varphi^* \Omega_2 = c \Omega_1$.

In fact, if in addition we assume that the tangent map φ_* maps all infinitesimal automorphisms of (M_1, Ω_1) into infinitesimal automorphisms of (M_2, Ω_2) , then as a consequence of Thm. 6, we have that $\varphi^* \Omega_2 = c \Omega_1$. ■

It is important to point out that this conclusion cannot be reached unless this new hypothesis is assumed, since the starting set of assumptions allows us to prove only that φ_* maps locally Hamiltonian vector fields into locally Hamiltonian vector fields; but this result cannot be extended to Hamiltonian m -multivector fields, with $m > 1$.

8 Conclusions and outlook

We have shown that locally homogeneous multisymplectic forms are characterized by their automorphisms (finite and infinitesimal). As it was pointed in the introduction it is remarkable that it is not known a Darboux-type theorem for multisymplectic manifolds, although a class of multisymplectic manifolds with a local structure defined by Darboux type coordinates has been characterized [10]. This has forced us to use a proof that does not rely on normal forms. The statement in Theorem 1 can be made slightly more restrictive assuming that we are given a bijective map $\varphi: M_1 \rightarrow M_2$ such that it sends elements $f \in G(M_1, \Omega_1)$ to elements $\varphi \circ f \circ \varphi^{-1} \in G(M_2, \Omega_2)$, then along the proof of the theorem in Section 6 we show that φ is C^∞ . The generalization we present here uses the transitivity of the group of multisymplectic diffeomorphisms and is a simple consequence of theorems by Wechsler [33] and Boothby [7]. However we do not know yet if the continuity assumption for Φ can be dropped and replaced by weaker conditions like in the symplectic and contact cases. To answer these questions it would be necessary to describe the algebraic structure of the graded Lie algebra of infinitesimal automorphisms of the geometric structure as in the symplectic and volume cases [2]. A necessary first step in this direction will be describing the extension of Calabi's invariants to the multisymplectic setting.

We will like to stress that in the analysis of multisymplectic structures beyond the symplectic and volume manifolds, it is necessary to consider not only vector fields, but the graded Lie algebra of infinitesimal automorphisms of arbitrary order. Only the Lie subalgebra of derivations of degree zero is related to the group of diffeomorphisms, however derivations of all degrees are needed to characterize the invariants. It is also meaningful the fact (that was pointed out in Section 4) that there are “exceptional” multisymplectic geometries (i.e., multisymplectic forms) whose group of automorphisms is finite-dimensional.

Finally, we want to remark that Theorem 5 (which plays a relevant role in this work) is just a partial geometric generalization for multisymplectic manifolds of Lee Hwa Chung's theorem. A complete generalization would have to characterize invariant forms of every degree (work in this direction is in progress). Our guess is that, in order to achieve this, additional hypothesis must be considered, namely: strong nondegeneracy of the multisymplectic form and invariance by locally Hamiltonian multivector fields of every order. Nevertheless, it is important to point out that the hypothesis that we have assumed here (1-nondegeneracy, local homogeneity and invariance by locally Hamiltonian vector fields and locally Hamiltonian $(k-1)$ -multivector fields) have been sufficient for our aim. This is a relevant fact since, as an example, in the jet bundle description of classical field theories (the regular case), the Lagrangian and Hamiltonian multisymplectic forms are just 1-nondegenerate [11, 15, 16, 18, 20, 23, 25, 30, 31], and in the analysis of the field equations, only locally Hamiltonian $(k-1)$ -multivector fields are relevant [13, 14].

Acknowledgments

The authors want to thank F. Cantrijn and G. Bor for their useful remarks and comments during the preparation of this work.

The author AI wishes to acknowledge the partial financial support provided by CICYT

under the programmes PB95-0401 and PB98-0861 NATO collaborative research grant 940195 and the CRM for the hospitality and facilities provided by the Institute were part of this work was done.

The authors AEE, MCML, NRR wish to thank the financial support of CICYT programmes TAP94-0552-C03-02 and PB98-0821.

References

- [1] C.J. ATKIN, J. GRABOWSKI, “Homomorphisms of the Lie algebras associated with a symplectic manifold”, *Comp. Math.*, **76** (1990) 315-349.
- [2] A. BANYAGA, “Sur la structure du groupe des difféomorphismes qui préservent une forme symplectique”, *Comment. Math. Helv.*, **53** (1978) 174-227.
- [3] A. BANYAGA, “On isomorphic classical diffeomorphism groups. I”, *Proc. Am. Math. Soc.*, **98** (1986) 113-118.
- [4] A. BANYAGA, “On isomorphic classical diffeomorphism groups. II”, *J. Diff. Geom.*, **28** (1988) 23-35.
- [5] A. BANYAGA, *The structure of classical diffeomorphism groups*. Mathematics and its Applications **400**. Kluwer Acad. Pub. Group., Dordrecht (1997). 113-118.
- [6] A. BANYAGA, A. MCINERNEY, “On Isomorphic Classical Diffeomorphism Groups III”, *ANN. GLOBAL ANAL. GEOM.*, **13** (1995) 117-127.
- [7] W. M. BOOTHBY, “Transitivity of the automorphisms of certain geometric structures”, *Amer. Math. Soc.*, **137** (1969) 93-100.
- [8] R.L. BRYANT, “Metrics with exceptional holonomy”, *Ann. Math. (2)* **126**(3) (1987) 525-576.
- [9] F. CANTRIJN, A. IBORT, M. DE LEÓN, “Hamiltonian Structures on Multisymplectic manifolds”. *Rend. Sem. Mat. Univ. Pol. Torino* **54**, (1996) 225-236.
- [10] F. CANTRIJN, A. IBORT, M. DE LEÓN. “On the geometry of multisymplectic manifolds”, *J. Austral. Math. Soc. Ser.* **66** (1999) 303-330.
- [11] J.F. CARIÑENA, M. CRAMPIN, L.A. IBORT, “On the multisymplectic formalism for first order field theories”, *Diff. Geom. Appl.*, **1** (1991) 345-374.
- [12] J.F. CARIÑENA, J. GOMIS, L.A. IBORT, N. ROMÁN-ROY, “Canonical transformation theory for presymplectic systems”, *J. Math. Phys.* **26** (1985) 1961-1969.
- [13] A. ECHEVERRÍA-ENRÍQUEZ, M.C. MUÑOZ-LECANDA, N. ROMÁN-ROY, “Multivector Fields and Connections. Setting Lagrangian Equations in Field Theories”, *J. Math. Phys.* **39**(9) (1998) 4578-4603.
- [14] A. ECHEVERRÍA-ENRÍQUEZ, M.C. MUÑOZ-LECANDA, N. ROMÁN-ROY, “Multivector Field Formulation of Hamiltonian Field Theories: Equations and Symmetries”, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **32** (1999) 8461-8484.
- [15] A. ECHEVERRÍA-ENRÍQUEZ, M.C. MUÑOZ-LECANDA, N. ROMÁN-ROY, “Geometry of Multisymplectic Covariant Hamiltonian Field Theories”, *J. Math. Phys.* (2000). To appear.

- [16] G. GIACHETTA, L. MANGIAROTTI, G. SARDANASHVILY, *New Lagrangian and Hamiltonian Methods in Field Theory*, World Sci. Pub. Co., Singapore (1997).
- [17] J. GOMIS, J. LLOSA, N. ROMÁN-ROY, “Lee Hwa Chung theorem for presymplectic manifolds. Canonical transformations for constrained systems”, *J. Math. Phys.* **25** (1984) 1348-1355.
- [18] M.J. GOTAY, “A Multisymplectic Framework for Classical Field Theory and the Calculus of Variations I: Covariant Hamiltonian formalism”, *Mechanics, Analysis and Geometry: 200 Years after Lagrange*, M. Francaviglia Ed., Elsevier Science Pub. (1991) 203-235.
- [19] J. GRABOWSKI, “Isomorphisms of the Jacobi and Poisson brackets”, Preprint ESI 5 (1993).
- [20] S.P. HRABAK, “On a Multisymplectic Formulation of the Classical BRST Symmetry for First-Order Field Theories (Part II): Geometric Structures”. math-ph/9901013 (1999).
- [21] L. HWA CHUNG, “The Universal Integral Invariants of Hamiltonian Systems and Applications to the Theory of Canonical Transformations”, *Proc. Roy. Soc.* **LXIIA** (1947) 237-246.
- [22] L.A. IBORT, “Multisymplectic manifolds: general aspects and particular situations”. *Proc. IX Fall Workshop on Geometry and Physics*, Vilanova i la Geltrú, Spain (2000). X. Gràcia, J. Marín-Solano, M.C. Muñoz-Lecanda, N. Román-Roy Eds. (To appear).
- [23] I.V. KANATCHIKOV, “Canonical structure of Classical Field Theory in the polymomentum phase space”, *Rep. Math. Phys.* **41**(1) (1998) 49-90.
- [24] J. LLOSA, N. ROMÁN-ROY, “Invariant forms and Hamiltonian systems: A Geometrical Setting”, *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **27**(12) (1988) 1533-1543.
- [25] J.E. MARSDEN, S. SHKOLLER, “Multisymplectic Geometry, Covariant Hamiltonians and Water Waves”, *Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.* **125** (1999) 553-575.
- [26] J. MARTINET, “Sur les singularités des formes différentielles”, *Ann. Inst. Fourier, Grenoble*, **20**(1) (1970) 95-178.
- [27] J. MOSER, “On the volume element on a manifold”. *Am. Math. Soc. Trans.*, **120**, 286-294 (1962).
- [28] H. OMORI, “Infinite dimensional Lie transformation groups”. *Lect. Notes in Maths.*, vol. **427**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin and New York (1974).
- [29] L.E. PURSELL, M.E. SHANKS, “The Lie algebra of smooth manifolds”. *Proc. Am. Math. Soc.*, **5**(3) (1954) 468-472.
- [30] G. SARDANASHVILY, *Generalized Hamiltonian Formalism for Field Theory*, World Scientific Pub., Singapore, 1995.
- [31] D.J. SAUNDERS, *The Geometry of Jet Bundles*, London Math. Soc. Lect. Notes Ser. **142**, Cambridge, Univ. Press, 1989.
- [32] F. TAKENS, “Characterization of a differentiable structure by its group of diffeomorphisms”. *Bol Soc. Brasil. Mat.*, **10** (1979) 17-25.
- [33] M. WECHSLER, “Homeomorphism groups of certain topological spaces”, *Ann. Math.*, **62** (1954) 360-373.